DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 736 UD 019 683

AUTHOR	Ogbu, John U.
TITLE	Cross Cultural Resource Center Institute on Parent Participation: An Evaluation Report. Bilingual Education Training Series.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Sacramento. Cross-Cultural Resource Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 78
NOTE	38p.; For related documents see UD 019 684-688
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Community Involvement; Cultural Factors; *Educational Anthropology; Multicultural Education; *Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; Staff Improvement; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This paper evaluates the Institute's training program, which was designed to help teachers and other educators make parent participation and community involvement in bilingual/bicultural education more effective. Focused on is the effectiveness of the anthropological techniques to which participants in the training program were introduced. The training program and its objectives are described, as well as the design of the evaluation, particularly its "ethnographic component." Responses of the training program participants to an evaluation questionnaire are summarized. Taken into account are the language, ethnic, and general background characteristics of the participants and their knowledge about a cultural approach to parent participation before and after the training program. Response data are analyzed and findings are discussed. Recommendations concerning efforts of the training program to make bilingual/bicultural education more effective are outlined. (EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Bilingual Education Training Series

ED174736

CROSS CULTURAL RESOURCE CENTER
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819
(916) 454-6236

CROSS CULTURAL RESOURCE CENTER
INSTITUTE ON PARENT PARTICIPATION

An Evaluation Report

by

John U. Ogbu
Associate Professor of Anthropology
University of California, Berkeley

September 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. I. Johannes
Cross Cultural Resource Center
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This publication was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education; no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

This publication was printed with funds provided by the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by Public Law 93.380.

This report is for limited distribution only. Please do not reproduce or distribute further without the permission of the Cross Cultural Resource Center.

UD019683

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
Introduction	1
Cross Cultural Institute on Parent Participation	3
Design of the Evaluation	5
Part I: Summary of Questionnaire Responses	7
School, Community, & Geographical Backgrounds of Institute's Participants	7
Language-Group Representation	8
"Ethnic" Representation	9
Title VII Project Background	9
Knowledge of a Cultural Approach to Parent Participation Before and After Training	9
Participants' Attitudes Toward Future CCRC Training Programs	11
Part II: Interpretation of Data	13
Objectives of the Cross Cultural Resource Center	13
(i) Culture as a Conceptual Tool in Parent Participation	13
(ii) Dissemination of Information on Parent Participation	14
(iii) Exposure to Different Models of Parent Participation	15
(iv) Opportunity to Share Ideas in Small Work Group Sessions	17
(v) Building Friendship and Professional Networks	20
Why They Came: The Trainees' Objectives	20
Parent Participation - a Multi Definition of the Problem and Its Solutions	23
Summary of Findings	28
Recommendations	30
References	34

PREFACE

Evaluation is at the heart of the bilingual, cross cultural educational movement, especially as it relates to the documentation and analysis of innovative activities. High quality evaluation is important in guiding decision-making and in disseminating information about performance and achievement in operationalizing programs. Evaluation of support services, such as the activities sponsored by the Training Resource Centers, is especially needed due to the diversity which exists among the different types of centers forming the national network for bilingual education.

This report both documents how training can be approached in a large institute format and provides an evaluation of one particularly critical training area -- that related to parent participation and community involvement in bilingual education. We at the Cross Cultural Resource Center take this opportunity to share with the public an example of one of the many approaches we utilize in evaluating our own in-service training activities. This document presents a qualitative approach to evaluation, even though quantitative data are also presented.

The author, Dr. John Ogbu, is a well known and internationally respected ethnographer and educational anthropologist. The results of his community studies involving minority education have been published in The Next Generation (1974) and Minority Education Caste (1978), as well as numerous articles and reports. We feel it is particularly appropriate that Dr. Ogbu has used his training as an ethnographer to evaluate CCRC's training institute on a Cross Cultural Approach to Parent Participation. His qualitative and descriptive approach provides an in-depth undertanding of what took place at the institute, pointing both to its relative strengths and weaknesses, as well as making recommendations for our consideration concerning the planning of future training activities.

The nature of some activities in bilingual, cross cultural education requires innovative techniques and approaches to evaluation, such as those employed by Dr. Ogbu. In this respect the more traditional pre-and post-, quantitative and parametric assessment of participants' entry and exit levels is inadequate for assessing the dynamics of a very diverse group of trainees and a very intense and unique training sequence. We believe that there are a number of aspects to bilingual education that require documentation through multiple approaches and techniques, both qualitative and quantitative.

As times become more difficult, due to societal conditions (economic and political) beyond our control, it is important for those of us in bilingual education to firmly and professionally pursue the highest of standards in taking a critical look at our own activities and, where appropriate, to inform the public as to the progress being made in our programs. Hopefully, the straight forward presentation of rigorously gathered evaluation data will help build the confidence necessary to sustain bilingual, cross cultural education within the United States.

If, in reading the enclosed document, you have any questions regarding ethnographic or qualitative approaches to evaluation, please feel free to contact our staff at the CCRC. We are committed to providing support services in this area to fellow Title VII projects and personnel.

STEVEN F. ARVIZU, Director
Cross Cultural Resource Center

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report has been prepared at the request of the Cross Cultural Resource Center, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento. The Center contacted me earlier this year during its preparation for the Institute on Parent Participation in Bilingual Education and asked if I would do an anthropological or qualitative evaluation of it.

What the Center meant by an anthropological or qualitative evaluation is best described on pages 60 - 63 of its end-of-year final report for 1977 (Cross Cultural Resource Center 1977b). According to this report, a qualitative evaluation is a holistic evaluation of an event (e.g. a training institute) or an assessment of an event in its total context by means of traditional anthropological techniques of participant-observation, interviewing, case histories, and the like. A qualitative evaluation is intended to tap some information not otherwise adequately obtained by means of questionnaire surveys for quantitative evaluation. Another strong reason for doing the qualitative evaluation is that the diverse populations served by the institute, especially the parents from many minority communities, are not used to responding to questionnaire surveys; thus, even though such surveys can be conveniently and economically administered by simply asking the trainees to fill them out at the conclusion of the institute, their interpretations are often problematic. This is illustrated by the fact that a large number of the participants in the present institute not only failed to complete the questionnaire distributed by the Center, but

also tended to give multiple responses to the same questions where this was not necessary. This finding also agrees with my own experience in doing fieldwork in a community similar to those from which many of the parent trainees in the present institute had come (Ogbu 1974). A better way, then, to secure more adequate information from such diverse populations is through ethnographic techniques of participant-observation, interviewing, and so forth.

I should point out, however, that an ethnographic study of an institute such as this one is limited by its short duration. As any ethnographer knows, it takes months to establish an adequate rapport with representative informants "in the field". Such a rapport can hardly be expected in a 3-day period. Nevertheless, my asset as an ethnographer in the institute included the visibility of my role as an evaluator which was made possible by a formal introduction to them. Another factor which helped the study was the friendly atmosphere of the institute which made it easy for me to initiate friendly interactions with informants readily. Because of these two factors, I found that by the end of the second day of the institute potential informants were not only eager to be interviewed but were also initiating informal and formal discussions of their experiences at the institute with me, including how such experiences related to their past and future roles in bilingual education.

Important as the qualitative evaluation is, the Cross Cultural Resource Center also believes that it should be conducted along with quantitative evaluation because a total picture of the institute emerges by combining the two. As the forementioned report notes, "Drawing upon both the perspective and the methodology of anthropology,

we approach evaluation in a qualitative, as well as quantitative, fashion. The two approaches complement each other and strengthen an effort in evaluation and in inquiry" (page 60).

CROSS CULTURAL INSTITUTE ON PARENT PARTICIPATION

The Cross Cultural Resource Center (CCRC) is a federally funded project located at California State University, Sacramento, to offer support training which would facilitate the success of bilingual education programs in Regions IX (California, Arizona, Nevada, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa and The Trust Territory of the Pacific). The training covers three main areas and their relation to bilingual education, namely, culture, parent participation, and innovation. And the training is conducted both for bilingual/bicultural educational personnel and for members of the communities from which the programs draw their pupils (Cross Cultural Resource Center 1977b:3-6).

In some important respects the training offered by the Center is unique. For example, unlike other training programs, the Center emphasizes an anthropological approach, which means that it uses holistic, cross-cultural (comparative), and ethnographic techniques in teaching the trainees what they have to learn and apply. The first institute based on this tradition was conducted in 1977 and focused on culture and its relation to bilingual education. The second training institute now being evaluated took place between May 31 and June 2, 1978 and focused on parent participation in bilingual education. A third institute planned for the future will

deal with innovation in bilingual education.

The institute on parent participation, held on the campus of California State University at Sacramento, was jointly sponsored by the Cross Cultural Resource Center and the Central Valley Association of Bilingual Educators. The overall objective of the institute was to train parents and bilingual school personnel in "knowledge, tools, and skills instrumental to involving parents and community organizations in programs of bilingual education and (in) developing supportive home/school relationships" (Cross Cultural Resource Center 1977b:3). That is, to make parent participation in bilingual education more effective. This training was to be accomplished through the following specific objectives: (a) teaching of culture concept as an aid to parent participation; (b) dissemination of information on parent participation; (c) presentation of different models to parent participation; (d) providing opportunity for trainees to interact and share ideas on parent participation with one another, especially in small work-groups; and (e) enabling trainees to develop new friendship and professional contacts or networks among themselves which can continue after the institute.

The trainees at the 1978 institute were recruited by means of flyers and letters sent to almost 1,000 local education authorities (i.e. school district program directors) and others on the Center's mailing list, beginning February 10, 1978. The recipients were informed that the institute was designed to train members of parent advisory committees and bilingual educators. A subsequent letter sent out in March gave more detailed information on specific goals of the institute. A copy of the institute's schedule was mailed in

advance to the trainees.

DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION

A first step in designing this evaluation was to find out: (a) the objectives of the Cross Cultural Resource Center in organizing the institute on parent participation; and (b) how the Center wished to accomplish these objectives. The information about these matters, described previously, was collected from a variety of sources: discussions with the director of the Center and his staff and from reading various documents prepared by the staff of the Center, including funding proposals, year-end final reports, and special papers prepared for the trainees (see Cross Cultural Resource Center 1977a, 1977b, 1977c; de Velasco 1978; Isáis 1978; Arvizu 1978; Arvizu and Snyder 1978). The task of designing this study was made easier by the fact that the Center had prepared an adequate survey questionnaire to be completed by all participants at the institute - parents, bilingual educators, workgroup facilitators, presentors and consultants. The questionnaire was based on the experiences of the Center director and his staff in previous training programs, including the summer institute of 1977. It was designed to tap demographic information, participants' roles in bilingual education, familiarity with the Center's unique "cultural approach" to training, participants' assessment of the institute and its various components, suggestions for improving future training institutes, and so forth (see sample questionnaire attached).

What I specifically added to the design was the "ethnographic component": participant-observation, formal and informal interviews

with individuals and groups at the institute, etc. I fully participated in as many aspects of the institute as possible, from a pre-training meeting of the staff of the institute on May 30 to an informal gathering of the Center's staff at the end of the institute on June 2. I attended all the general sessions of the institute and took notes on various presentations and responses from the audience. I remained with one small workgroup during the entire period and used my knowledge of developments in this group as basis for interviewing members of other groups. On the whole I interviewed more than 29 trainees, presentors, and consultants during the 3-day period. Some were interviewed individually either formally or informally; others were interviewed in small groups. These interviews lasted from ten minutes to more than one hour.

The interviews dealt with various aspects of the institute but emphasized two points not apparent in the questionnaire survey. First, informants were asked why they came to the institute. As indicated earlier, the Center knew what it wanted the trainees to gain from the institute. But it was equally important to know what the trainees thought they would gain by attending the institute and the extent to which they believed that their expectations had been met. Second, it was recognized in the early part of the institute that some non-Spanish-speaking minorities were concerned that the institute might not adequately address their unique needs. These fears were reduced somewhat when the schedule was modified to enable special interest groups based on language, "ethnicity", region, etc. to meet the morning of the last day. However, I thought that it was important and then made a concerted effort from the first day to interview as many of the non-Spanish-speaking trainees as possible about their

unique needs, expectations, and experiences at the institute.

The findings reported below are based on data collected by means of a questionnaire distributed by CCRC and by the ethnographic approach employed by the evaluator. Part I of the findings summarizes major points of the participants' responses to the questionnaire; Part II is the evaluator's interpretation of both types of data.

PART I: SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

School, Community, & Geographical Backgrounds of Institute's Participants

Fewer number of participants at the institute (146) returned their questionnaires than were reported to have registered on the second day of the training (217). According to the latter, 91 or 42 per cent were school personnel (teachers, teacher aides and community-school liaison workers, school counselors and administrators). Parents and community people numbered 54 or 25 per cent; students and other miscellaneous categories made up the rest. As can be seen from Table 1, parents constituted the largest single category of the participants.

Table 1: School and Community Backgrounds of Institute's Participants

Participant Category	No.	%
Parents/Community People	54	25
Aides/Liaison Workers	30	14
Teachers	30	14
School Counselors, etc.	7	3
School Administrators	24	11
Other Administrators	21	10
Students	14	6
Miscellaneous	37	17
Total	217	100

The geographical representation spanned beyond the Western states. Most participants (190) came from California, representing about 46 school districts, schools, and institutes and projects. Other states represented included Arizona (6), Illinois (1), New Mexico (2), Texas (6) and the State of Washington (3).

Language-Group Representation

As in the previous institute, the trainees represented diverse language groups, though often technically inaccurately identified. These are languages served by bilingual education programs in the trainees' school districts because the questionnaire simply asked trainees to indicate the language groups they worked with rather than the languages they themselves spoke. Consequently, we get many combinations in the responses, like Filippino/English (where "Filippino" could mean any or include many of the languages spoken in the Filippines) or "Asian" (which may include Japanese, Korean, Cantonese, etc.). More specific "languages" mentioned include the following: Cantonese, "Chinese", English, Apache, Ilacano, Korean, Japanese, Portuguese, Pitt River Indian, Punjabi, Spanish, Samoa, Tagalog, "Vietnamese", etc.

The language group that most trainees worked with primarily and in combination with many others is Spanish. Some individuals indicated that their programs served several language groups (e.g. Chinese/Filippino/Mexican/Pakistani/Vietnamese) and sometimes they focused on only two, such as English/Spanish.

"Ethnic" Representation

The "ethnic" makeup of the trainees is just as diverse and technically inaccurate as the language groups they represented. They identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Anglo, Asian, Black, Central American, Chicano, Chinese, Cuban, East Indian, Filippino, Danish, Irish, Japanese, Jewisn-Ashkenazi, Lebanese, Mexican American, Latino, Pacific Islander, Native American (Paiute, Pitt River Indian), Polynesian, Spanish American, Polish American, Dutch, Yaqui, etc. Some not comfortable with ethnic identification described themselves as "Americans" or "human beings".

Title VII Project Background

As can be seen from Table 2, approximately 64 per cent of the participants responding to this particular question indicated that prior to coming to the institute they worked with Title VII projects.

Table 2: Title VII Project Background

Participant Category	No. Responding	No. Working With Project	% Working With Project
Parents/Community People	34	14	41
Aides/Liaison Workers	30	22	73
Teachers	27	19	70
School Counselors, etc.	13	9	69
School Administrators	14	12	86
Students (High School)	7	2	29
Miscellaneous	13	10	77
Total	138	88	64

Knowledge of a Cultural Approach to Parent Participation Before and After Training

Only a small number (34 percent) of the participants at the

institute knew about a cultural approach to parent participation in bilingual/bicultural education. However, at the end of the training a very large proportion of the participants (75 percent) said that they had gained a greater understanding of this approach. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the effect of the training on participants' understanding of the approach.

Table 3: Degree of Participants' Knowledge of the Cultural Approach To Parent Participation Prior to Attending the Institute

Participant Category	No. Responding	Very Well Informed	Well Informed	Somewhat Informed	Hardly Informed	Not Informed
Parents	37	16%	19%	24%	19%	22%
Aides, etc.	31	13	19	48	3	16
Teachers	29	-	28	45	21	6
Sch. Admin.	14	14	29	43	14	-
Sch. Counselors	13	23	15	54	8	-
H.S. Students	6	16	33	16	-	33
Mscellan.	13	8	23	38	31	-
Total	146	12%	22%	39%	15%	12%

Table 4: Degree of Participants' Understanding of the Cultural Approach To Parent Participation After Training

Participant Category	No. Responding	Very Well Informed	Well Informed	Somewhat Informed	Hardly Informed	Not Informed
Parents	38	42%	24%	21%	11%	3%
Aides, etc.	31	42	26	13	13	6
Teachers	29	52	34	10	3	-
Sch. Admin.	14	43	29	7	-	21
Sch. Counselors	13	15	54	23	8	-
H.S. Students	7	57	43	-	-	-
Mscellan.	14	29	64	7	-	-
Total	146	41%	34%	14%	7%	4%

In addition to gaining a greater understanding of the cultural approach to parent participation, most participants (77 percent) said that the institute was quite valuable and a similar large proportion (74 percent) said they would use the knowledge and understanding they had gained at the institute in their work when they returned to their local areas or projects.

Participants' Attitudes Toward Future CCRC Training Programs

Most participants expressed a very strong enthusiasm about participating in future training institutes sponsored by CCRC. As Table 5 shows, approximately 79 percent of those responding said they would attend another training in a cultural approach to parent participation if such an institute were organized again by CCRC.

Table 5: Degrees of Institute's Participants' Interests in Attending A Future Institute on the Cultural Approach to Parent Participation in Bilingual/Bicultural Education

Participant Category	Responding	Definitely	Maybe	Probably Not	Definitely Not
Parents	27	78%	22%	-%	-%
Aides, etc.	24	71	25	4	-
Teachers	28	82	18	-	-
Sch. Admin.	12	67	17	8	8
Counselors, etc.	10	90	10	-	-
H.S. Students	6	100	-	-	-
Mscellan.	14	96	2	2	-
Total	121	79%	18%	2%	1%

Participants also expressed their relative interests in future participation in all the major specific topics of the CCRC training institutes, as shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Participants' Expressed Interests in Participation in Specific Training Areas of CCRC Institutes

Specific Training Areas	No. of Respondents	Will Definitely Attend	May Attend	Definitely Will Not Attend
Culture	99	82%	12%	6%
Parent Participation	110	79	17	4
Innovation & Change in Education	97	81	17	2
Evaluation of Bilingual/ Bicultural Education Programs	107	86	11	3

It is significant to note the high degree of interest in two major topics on which CCRC plans to sponsor training according to the present training sequence; that is, Innovation and Change in Education and Evaluation of Bilingual and Bicultural Education Programs. With regard to the most effective way for CCRC to provide its training, institute participants were about equally divided between those favoring a central location training institute (84 percent) and those preferring on-site training in local schools or school districts (80 percent). However, when forced to choose between the two, the preference was definitely for a centralized institute training (57 percent) rather than for on-site training (36 percent) or both (7 percent). Perhaps the preference for the institute format is because it permits bringing together participants and consultants from many districts and backgrounds which would be difficult in on-site training.

PART II: INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Objectives of the Cross Cultural Resource Center

As indicated earlier, the Cross Cultural Resource Center had five objectives it wished to use to train parents and educators to be more effective in facilitating parent participation in bilingual education. This evaluation was not designed to study the degree to which the trainees became more competent in effecting parent participation at the end of the institute, because such competence can be measured only by studying how the trainees actually apply their skills "back home" in their local school districts. What was studied at the end of the institute and summarized here is the extent to which various techniques used by the Center effectively taught the trainees about parent participation as perceived by the trainees. Using information from ethnographic interviews and the questionnaire survey, I summarize here the extent to which these objectives of the Center (i.e. effective use of the teaching techniques) appeared to have been accomplished as follows.

(i) Culture as a Conceptual Tool in Parent Participation

Two questions in the questionnaire, the responses of which have already been summarized (Tables 3 and 4 above), permit an assessment of the extent to which the institute successfully taught the trainees how the concept of culture might serve as a conceptual tool in promoting parent participation in bilingual/bicultural education programs. The first asked the trainees how much they understood the "cultural approach" to parent participation prior to coming to the institute. The second asked about the extent to which attending the institute had

broadened their understanding of this approach.

The concept of culture and its relation to bilingual education were explained to the trainees by means of films and a monograph (Monograph #1: Demystifying the Concept of Culture: Theoretical and Conceptual Tools). It is doubtful that many trainees had had a chance to read the monograph before filling out their questionnaires. We think therefore that the participants were responding mainly on the basis of the impact of films and oral presentations. What is important to note is that most of them said that they were coming out of the institute better informed. The use of the films was particularly appreciated by participants. As one school administrator expressed the general sentiment: "The films were very informative, but where can you get them for free? Does your Center lease them?"

(ii) Dissemination of Information on Parent Participation

The institute did an excellent job in presenting trainees with diverse information on parent participation, including theoretical models and illustrative case studies on the problem. This information was made available to the trainees in the form of papers specially prepared by the Center Staff & Consultants (de Velasco 1978; Isáis 1978; Arvizu 1978), other documents or papers xeroxed and distributed by the Center, presentations by invited guest speakers and the handouts they brought with them, and summaries of discussions of various small workgroup sessions on parent participation. The trainees were very appreciative of these materials, indeed they were very appreciative of all the information they got about parent participation.

The success of this objective can be seen in the comments of

various categories of trainees. A Chicano parent and community-school liaison worker expressed the feeling of many when she said: "This is the first time that a conference has made me feel that I have heard something different, given me new ideas which I can try in recruiting parents and (getting) them interested in school participation." Another Chicano bilingual community worker commented, "It was really good for me- gave me a lot of information." A Chicano aide said that the "Written materials are very valuable; Films very effective." Said a Chicano resource teacher, "The materials that were given are very informative. I am planning to read all of them this summer." A Yaqui educator reflecting on his past experience said, "Our bilingual program has been implemented since March 1978. My own experience working with bilingual education has been done on my own ideas, and some hit and miss. This conference has given me a sense of unity and I now know that I am not alone." Of the films and written materials a Portuguese teacher said, "(They) were very good. It's great to attend a conference where most of the information is already prepared for you so that you don't have to take notes; you still receive the bulk of the materials and information." An Anglo Title VII TRC staff member responded, "Excellent. My frustration arises from the expectation that when I return to the office my colleagues will confiscate the materials before I have a chance to review them." Others described the wealth of the information as "rich" or "Very good."

(iii) Exposure to Different Models of Parent Participation

Because different school situations respond differently to or even

demand different strategies to parent participation, the institute presented the trainees with three models of approaches or strategies to parent participation. These were conflict, equilibrium, and eclectic models. Each was presented at three levels. First, each model was explained and a case study illustrating it described in a paper prepared by the Center, Home-School Linkages: A Cross-Cultural Approach to Parent-Participation (pages 6-15). Second, a guest speaker directly involved in a given approach described his or her case, including its history and the eventual outcomes; and the speaker responded to trainees' questions. Third, copies of case studies illustrating the different models were made available to trainees. Some speakers supplemented the latter with additional materials.

Data from questonnaire survey and ethnographic research strongly suggest that this teaching objective was very successful. Everyone I interviewed liked being presented with the different approaches to parent participation, often pointing out that one approach may not work in all situations and at all times. A similar response was given by the majority of the trainees to a question in the survey questionnaire asking whether it was useful to teach the different approaches to parent participation. The trainees were also asked to explain why they agreed or disagreed with the question. Typical responses from various categories of trainees are as follows. A Chicano parent answered the question by saying, "Yes, they know that if there is not one that works why not try another." Another parent and a member of advisory committee said that "Because of the diversity of problems (associated with parent participation)" it was good to

know more than one strategy. A Chicano teacher noted that this is important "because different communities are sometimes faced with different obstacles before themselves and need to be provided (with knowledge of) these different approaches." Another teacher said that the comparative strategies "opened different awareness(es) that I hadn't considered. Often times we educators get 'stuck' with 'how to obtain parent participation' and it's great to know other solutions and views." An Anglo parent-involvement specialist liked the approach very much; said he, "Yes, working in our communities can lead to becoming somewhat ego-centric. I think that regardless of how effective our groups may be, there is always a need for continued review and outside inputs to keep in mind that the goals of bilingual/bicultural education have a regional and material fabric as well." "It became clear," commented an Anglo school administrator, "for those who did not already understand it, that no one approach is universally effective." Finally, an Indian parent said she was glad to learn of new ways of handling the problem of parent participation.

The strong positive valuation of the alternative strategies also shows up in the trainees' comments about the guest speakers who received very high praise. Even when asked to indicate the most valuable aspects of the institute, many trainees mentioned the alternative strategies and the guest speakers who presented them.

(iv) Opportunity to Share Ideas in Small Work Group Sessions

Opportunity to participate in small work group sessions was equally highly praised by the trainees. As originally conceived by the planners

of the institute, the small work group sessions were to provide opportunities for trainees from different backgrounds to share ideas about parent participation based on their varied experiences. This sharing would progress through three phases: the first day would be devoted to "problems" in parent participation; the second day would focus on "obstacles" to elimination of these problems; and the third day would map out feasible solutions, plan of action or strategies to deal with the problems and the obstacles. There were 10 work groups, each under a leader or facilitator. At the end of each day a summary of the discussion of each group was typed up and distributed to all participants, so that everyone learned about what went on in other groups. The work group pattern was modified the third day to allow the meeting of special interest groups, especially those based on common language, ethnicity or region.

Both ethnographic and survey data indicate that most people thought highly of the small workgroups they participated in, as well as the general idea. There were many reasons why the trainees liked the small work group sessions. First, it was the only place many of them felt that they had a real dialogue on the issue of parent participation; second, it was the only place where shy trainees were able to express themselves comfortably; and third, trainees shared with one another more effectively their experiences in dealing with parent participation and bilingual education. Here are some comments which illustrate how the trainees felt about the small work group sessions. A Chicano community liaison worker said, "I really enjoyed the small work groups. Let's have more time on the small work groups next time around." A Chicano parent commented that "They were dynamic. Many

different perspectives were presented. I think the idea of small work groups was the key to success." A shy parent said, "I felt comfortable to open up and speak." A Chicano school administrator commented, "I liked small work groups because (a) all could participate; (b) the leader didn't lecture; and (c) sharing of information from all levels was great." A bilingual consultant reported that in his group things went very well and "everybody had a chance to participate." An Indian parent said, "I found it (the small work group) very interesting because there were things that were brought out different than what we do." "It is the only way to go," said a Japanese teacher. "It is more democratic. More is accomplished (in small work groups)." But they were not perfect, as will be shown below. An Anglo teacher thought they could have been more effective if they had employed the "techniques of brainstorming."

Although the trainees mostly praised the small work group idea and acknowledged learning a lot from their groups, many also criticized the way the groups were organized on at least four grounds: lack of sufficient time; lack of focus on specific solutions to problems of parent participation; domination of group discussions by one or two individuals, often teachers or administrators; and inadequate arrangement to meet the needs of mutually exclusive language speakers. School personnel complained most about the lack of time and lack of focus on specific solutions, but the time factor was also mentioned by several parents. Typical statements expressing frustration over the fact that group discussions were terminated without reaching meaningful conclusions included the following: "Good-but needed more time for discussion; interaction limited because of

(lack of) time," said a Chicano teacher. "Not enough time for discussion," said another Chicano teacher. An East Indian teacher also commented, "Good but too little time for the large number of people in each group." And a Yaqui said, "The small work groups were above all the most valuable to me. This gives me the opportunity to share and compare with others my failures and my successes. Unfortunately these groups weren't allowed enough time."

(v) Building Friendship and Professional Networks

Most people I interviewed said that the small work groups provided them with best opportunity to make new friends and professional contacts with people who had similar interests. This function was also served by coffee breaks, lunch periods, and other informal gathering occasions. On the whole it seemed that many trainees took the initiative to develop friendship and professional relations during the institute.

In summary, the institute was very successful with regard to the five objectives of the Cross Cultural Resource Center. Most trainees who returned their questionnaires (79 percent) said they would definitely participate in another CCRC training institute on parent participation (see Table 5 above).

Why They Came: The Trainees' Objectives

Although the Cross Cultural Resource Center effectively used various approaches to train participants in different aspects of parent participation in bilingual/bicultural education programs, most trainees were specifically interested in one aspect of such participation, namely, specific feasible strategies which can be applied in their local school districts. They came primarily looking for solutions.

This is because many of them "assume" that they already knew what the problems were. This does not necessarily mean that their "assumptions" are accurate and yet, we have to understand that the assumptions did influence their expectations. From this point of view, many of the participants (both in interviews and in questionnaire returns) did not feel that they found such solutions at the institute, regardless of how much they said they liked the institute. Many expected that the small work groups would deal with specific solutions and appeared disappointed that this did not happen. Therefore a major criticism of these work groups was that they did not focus on solutions to problems of parent participation on the third day of the institute as scheduled initially. For example, one parent and a member of a parent advisory committee said that the small work group sessions were "valuable but did not deal with specific solutions to particular problems." An aide said, "I found the small work groups dealing with problems without solutions. They tended to channel their energies on (to) what were causes rather than what courses of action to take." Another trainee said, "The small work groups, they need more time to deal with solutions instead of a lot of comments, opinions and what have you." Some teachers and school administrators also thought that the institute, and especially the small work groups, should have focused on providing solutions to problems of parent participation. One teacher said that her small group sessions were not very valuable because they did not focus on how to get parents more involved.

Other school personnel expressed even a stronger need for focus on solutions. As one school administrator expressed it: "I felt that

solutions were not generally expressed or really suitable." Commenting on the small work group sessions, one parent-involvement specialist said, "They are interesting but in the relatively short period of time devoted to (them), it was difficult to get past the rhetorical phase. I think most of us assigned here are aware of (the) problems and obstacles. (What we need) more to be discussed are--practical, workable solutions." A bilingual education specialist thought that an institute on parent participation "should be work oriented, should be geared toward mapping out solutions or strategies and techniques that people can take back to apply in their local communities. And perhaps there should be two programs: one program designed for parents should focus on building parents' skills in dealing with schools; also a program designed for school people should focus on building the skills of teachers and administrators in dealing with parents."

These criticisms are not entirely justified. First, the claim by trainees that they already knew what the problems were is not always accurate; and as will be shown below, the trainees are divided in their definition of the problems. Second, the institute did provide them with solutions as can be seen from trainees' appreciation of being exposed to multiple approaches to the problem of parent participation. It can further be said that trainees acquired skills at the institute which would enable them to discover solutions appropriate to unique problems of their own local programs. Third, as noted earlier, it was the trainees themselves who voted for a change in the institute's program whereby the third day was not devoted to solutions as originally planned. Instead the trainees opted for the

use of the third day for meetings of special interest groups based on language, ethnicity, region, etc. In fact, the CCRC must be given credit for flexibility in changing its program in response to expressed needs of the trainees.

Parent Participation - a Multi Definition of the Problem and Its Solutions

Had the small work group devoted the last day to solutions, the result might still not have been satisfactory to all trainee categories. This is because the problem of parent participation and its solutions were viewed differently by different parties at the institute. The definition of parent participation provided by the Cross Cultural Resource Center is best suggested by the nature of various models or approaches to parent participation presented to the trainees, by the substance and tone of guest speakers' presentations, and by the nature of written materials given to the trainees, all of which tended to project the problem of parent participation as stemming primarily but not exclusively from the schools or the education system rather than from the community. This perspective was largely shared by many parents and non-school personnel at the institute.

On the other hand, a large proportion of the school personnel at the institute, from school-community liaison workers to school administrators, saw the problem of parent participation as stemming primarily but not exclusively from the community. Some thought that the presentations at the institute were, therefore, somewhat biased. As one teacher put it, "I feel there were far more negative attacks on schools and teachers than were positive approaches and solutions discussed. I also felt that when presentors spoke they emphasized parent power.... No one

really talked about the parents' responsibility that goes with that power.... If teachers need to be competent, then so must parents!! One cannot succeed without the other and parents' concerns continue to hide behind excuse (though often valid) they are using.... Parents must see improvements as a responsibility and not just a need."

As an outside observer, I see the problem of parent participation as stemming from both the school and the community, as do the obstacles and solutions. Factors on the school side which inhibit or discourage effective parent participation were well treated in various presentations, in documents and in small group discussions. A good deal of attention was given to what parents should know in order to participate effectively in bilingual education -- and these included legal, legislative, and educational information on parents' rights and some broad strategies of action.

But there are equally many factors in the community which inhibit or discourage parent participation which did not receive as much treatment at the institute. Furthermore, parent participation from the point of view of school personnel includes the fact that "parents should be interested in" and "responsible for" their children's education in ways traditionally defined by the school. Often school personnel regard a "lack of parent involvement" in this manner as a serious obstacle to success in bilingual education and in the education of children who do not come from white middle-class background in general. Thus schools sometimes employ school-community liaisons, school-community relations specialists (I once served in this capacity for one year), parent-involvement specialist, etc. "to get parents

more involved." There is no doubt that many school personnel -- administrators, teachers, counselors, parent-involvement specialist, community-school liaisons, teacher aides, etc. came to the institute looking for specific solutions to the problem of parent participation from this perspective. As educators dealing with parents, they came to gain more legislative, legal, and educational information on parents' rights in bilingual education. But more so they came to learn different specific approaches to "motivate parents to become more involved," as they put it. That is, they wanted to know what strategies to use to initiate and sustain parent "interest in" and "responsibility for" their children's education, not simply how to increase the veto power of parents over school program. Such approaches or models were not adequately covered or presented by the institute, perhaps because the institute was not oriented in this direction. The institute did not systematically examine those factors in the community which affect parent participation and how they can be dealt with. (Some of the small work groups did to some extent, but not systematically).

The preceding analysis is not meant to be a criticism of CCRC and its institute. It is simply meant to provide the CCRC staff with some insight into the differing perspectives of different categories of trainees. The staff may have recognized, of course, these differing viewpoints and needs, but chose to focus on the need for schools "to accommodate to the communities they serve" because of limited time and resources. The staff may also have felt that it is important for school personnel to see where parents are coming from and how parents view the school, a message the staff believed to have been adequately

conveyed by a cultural approach to parent participation.

In addition to differences between parents and school people, there were also differences in expectations between Chicanos and non-Chicanos. Before we discuss these differences it should be noted that about 80 percent of the children in CCRC service region are Chicanos. This no doubt accounts for preponderance of Chicano trainees and Chicano-related materials. Then, too, limited time and resources made it difficult to include more trainees, consultants, and materials from diverse background. I should also point out that in my observation other groups were very adequately represented at the consultant level.

Several differences of expectations emerged between Chicanos and non-Chicanos (e.g., Native Americans, Asian Americans, etc.). First, non-Chicanos interviewed felt that their cultures were not adequately emphasized, a balance which, as indicated above, is probably difficult to achieve given the limited resources of the Cross Cultural Resource Center. Second, the non-Chicanos complained that some speakers tended to resort to Spanish as if everyone understood it. Third, the problem of parent participation, they said, was not dealt with in ways that reflected the realities of their specific ethnic experiences.

Asian-American informants pointed out that various Asian communities differ from one another and that there are also differences within each group. For example, in Filippino and Chinese cultures attitudes toward school are different in many respects and that further differences exist within these communities in the United States. An example of the latter kind of differences is the

opposing attitudes of immigrant and non-immigrant Filippino and Chinese parents toward bilingual education; another is the kind of language problems faced by immigrant and non-immigrant Filippino and Chinese students; and still another is the way immigrant and non-immigrant parents perceive the problem of parent participation or parent involvement. One informant noted that Chinese parents in general tend to become involved in school in terms of specific issues or goals rather than as a matter of custom: they will, for example, attend parent-teacher conferences to discuss their children's work with the teacher; they will attend meetings to discuss "busing issues" if the latter involve removing their small children to distant neighborhoods, etc. At the same time, however, fear of repatriation minimizes the participation of immigrant Chinese parents even on these vital issues because they are conscious of their non-citizen status.

The point to be stressed with regard to the non-Chicano trainees is that they felt that the institute -- as originally organized - made little provision for dealing realistically with the unique factors affecting parent participation within their respective communities, and they (and Chicano participants as well) very much welcomed the rescheduling of the last day to allow groups to meet on the basis of special interests. How these groups felt about the rescheduling is reflected in the comments of some informants. One Indian parent said, for instance, "The most reasonable day was the last day because we all got together in our own group and we talked with the person from Oregon (about our special problems)." An Asian-American informant remarked that although there were only a few of them

in their caucus, they were able to initiate a discussion of the special needs of Asian-American parents which they hoped to continue after the institute. This positive evaluation of special interest groups (i.e., ethnic, regional, etc.) meetings should be read against trainees complaints that the small work groups did not deal with solutions to problems of parent participation.

Summary of Findings

We may briefly summarize the findings as follows:

1. The goals of the Cross Cultural Resource Center in organizing the institute and the specific techniques it used to achieve these goals were explicit and well communicated to the trainees in special papers, various documents, films, presentations/"lectures" and discussion groups.

2. The teaching techniques utilized at the institute were very effective, judging from reactions and remarks of the trainees and from my own observations.

3. The one aspect of the goals of the Cross Cultural Resource Center not adequately fulfilled was providing trainees with specific solutions or strategies -- the how to -- for solving the problem of parent participation. This was largely because the structure of the institute was changed at the request of the trainees to accommodate their expressed need to meet on the last day on the basis of special interests.

4. Different categories of trainees had somewhat different needs or expectations which were somewhat difficult to serve equally effectively within the broad goals and limited resources of the institute. The needs of some groups, such as parents, were more easily met by the

approaches used at the institute than the needs of school personnel. However, the latter were probably more likely to have taken advantage of one special aspect of the institute, a field-work course in parent participation, which provided additional training in conceptualizing and solving problems related to parent participation. This course, for which 25 people signed up, involved not only actual field study but also intensive reading and analysis of monographs I and II (Demystifying The Concept Of Culture: Theoretical And Conceptual Tools; and Demystifying The Concept Of Culture: Methodological And Techniques) and other materials.

5. Regardless of differences in specific needs, and expectations, most participants of all categories found the institute very valuable and thought it was very successful. They praised the Cross Cultural Resource Center director and his staff very highly for their foresightedness and skills in organizing the institute; for their warmth and hospitality to participants. The trainees found every guest speaker delightful and their presentations instructive. Because the guest speakers were mentioned by name so many times it seems pointless to list them here. The trainees also commended their small work group leaders and fellow members and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to build new personal and professional network in the small work groups and in the institute in general. A sample of their parting comments will illustrate the general feelings of the trainees about the institute. A parent education specialist from Texas said, "Everything was so well organized; I really don't have any recommendations -- other than, How about asking Dallas, Texas, to participate next time?" A Chicano parent said, "It was a very meaningful

experience for me to attend this conference. It was my first time to participate in something to do with bilingualism. This institute gave me a better understanding of those around me. Thanks to all of you who made this conference a worthwhile experience. Special thanks to Steve Arvizu who I really admire and appreciate." An aide commented, "The institute as a conference was great. The organization plus the changes that were made so smoothly (were) something all of you should well take pride in. The formal presentations, etc. (were) very good." A Portuguese teacher summed up the feeling of many school people when she said, "Overall I really think this conference was very good and very informative. It was easily seen that a great deal of work went into it and it was well organized. It was also great to see that parents were the dominant group. People running the conference were very nice and tried to always stay calm and pleased everyone."

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the above evaluation of the institute, comments by various participants not included in the summary, and my own observations and discussions with participants and staff of the institute. The recommendations are not intended to cover every aspect of the institute, most of which are very good and require no changes.

1. The concept of culture beyond its aesthetic and symbolic meaning should be included in future presentations. The presentations of culture as a theoretical concept or framework ought to include the dimension of power relations -- the nature of political and economic relations in the bilingual community, between that community, schools,

and dominant society, and within the schools themselves. (Some of these would probably have been covered if much time had not been lost in discussing language use at the institute on the first day). I think that in future institutes the monograph, Demystifying the Concept of Culture, ought to be made available to trainees who should be urged to read it before they arrived for the institute; perhaps this will improve their conceptual understanding during the institute presentation.

2. If resources are available, films and other materials presented to illustrate the culture of the bilingual minority groups should reflect more (a) the diversity of the groups represented at the institute and (b) the cultural adaptations that these groups have made in the United States.

3. Parents and school personnel definitely have somewhat different needs and expectations in the area of parent participation in bilingual/bicultural education. Future institutes on this theme should recognize their differences and should be organized to enable each group gain appropriate competence to facilitate effective parent participation. If time and resources permit, this can be achieved within a single, carefully planned institute, without resorting to separate workshops.

4. Most trainees were less interested in theoretical formulation and analytic models than in specific feasible solutions to local problems of parent participation. Therefore in future institutes more time should be spent on developing and teaching specific strategies that they can apply in their local projects. This is not to suggest a bandaid approach. It is rather to recognize that there are two levels

of needs. Some trainees were groping for "practical solutions" to "newly recognized problems" and this need must be taken into account in searching for more permanent broad-based solutions.

5. Most trainees (and my own observations) agreed that the small work group sessions were the best device to teach and learn specific solutions to parent participation problems. Therefore, future institutes should give these sessions more prominent role than was the case in 1978. In particular, they should be given more time to allow for menaingful discussions of specific problems and solutions. They should also be held in the morning when trainees are not tired or bored.

Some small work group sessions should be specifically designed as special interest sessions.

6. A majority of the trainees said they preferred attending an institute in a central location than attending on-site training in local school districts. However, in conducting such an institute in the future, greater efforts should be made to minimize trainee discomforts in terms of hotel accommodations, meals, and transportation. If future institutes must be held on the campus of California State University, Sacramento, Cross Cultural Resource Center should explore the possibility of housing trainees in dormitories or other campus housing facilities. This, as many participants suggested, will reduce at least the transportation problems.

7. The idea of providing childcare was a good one and should be continued.

8. Efforts should be made during future institutes presentations to group non-English-speaking participants together by language and

provide each group with an interpreter; this should increase their level of participation without adversely affecting the participation of others. Where such language groups are relatively large they should be constituted into work groups with the same tasks as other work groups. Of course, whatever gains derived from this suggested arrangement must be weighed against gains from interaction between members of different groups. The important thing is to be flexible.

9. If financial resources permit, written materials should be mailed to trainees in advance and provided to non-English speakers in their functional language. (There is no guarantee, of course, that those who received the materials would be the ones actually attending the institute, for as CCRC staff reported approximately 25 percent of the trainees in 1978 were substitutes who would not have received such pre-institute mailing). Also the distribution of materials during the institute should be organized more systematically to ensure that everyone received them without the embarrassment of rushing and scrambling for them.

My overall assessment of the institute is that it was very very successful. The suggestions made above are in accordance with the desire of CCRC to use the findings of this evaluation to improve its training institutes. And I commend the Center for its continual search for ways to make bilingual/bicultural education more effective.

REFERENCES

Arvizu, Steven F.
1978 Home-School Linkages: A Cross Cultural Approach to Parent Participation. Sacramento: Cross Cultural Resource Center. Unpublished manuscript.

Arvizu, Steven F. and Warren Snyder and Paul T. Espinoza
1978 Demystifying the Concept of Culture: Theoretical and Conceptual Tools, Monograph I. Sacramento: Cross Cultural Resource Center. Unpublished manuscript.

Cross Cultural Resource Center
1977a Continuation Application, March, 1977

1977b Year-End Final Report, November 30, 1977.

1977c Proposal, November, 1977.

de Velasco, Isabel Guzman
1978 A Guide for Effective Parent and Community Participation in Bilingual, Bicultural Education. Sacramento: Cross Cultural Resource Center. Unpublished manuscript.

Gibson, Margaret A. and Steven F. Arvizu
1977 Demystifying the Concept of Culture: Methodological Tools and Techniques, Monograph II. Sacramento: Cross Cultural Resource Center. Unpublished manuscript.

Isais, Raoul E.
1978 A Minority Perspective on a Cultural Approach to Parent Participation in Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education. Sacramento: Cross Cultural Resource Center. Unpublished manuscript.

Ogbu, John U.
1974 The Next Generation. New York: Academic Press.